

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 are pending. Claims 1, 3 and 12 have been amended herein. Support for the amendments is found at page 15, paragraph [0028], Fig. 5 and as set forth below.

**Applicant's Response to the Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 3, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata (JP 2001-186301) in view of Parsons et al. (US 7,031,437). In response thereto, applicants have amended parent claims 1, 3 and 12 to more distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Specifically, applicants have clarified that the means for transmitting the configuration data is directly transmitted to the prescribed apparatus. One of skill in the art would not derive the invention pursuant to the amended claims based on the combination of Murata and Parsons.

In the example set forth in Fig. 5 of applicant's specification, the communication terminal 100 requests a screen file from a server 20 (S10) and the server 20 provides the requested file (S12). Next, configuration data (S16) and destination identification information (S18) are entered. Thereafter, the configuration information is directly transmitted (S20) to the fax machine 200a.

The current Office Action asserts that Parsons teaches "configuring an apparatus from other than the prescribed apparatus." Page 3 of the Office Action. The Office asserts that based on this teaching in Parsons it would have been obvious to modify Murata as taught by Parsons "in order to conveniently configure devices with limited memory such as pagers and cell phones,

with the use of a centralized server.” Page 4 of the Office Action. However, applicant respectfully presents that Parsons does not teach that the cell phones, pagers or similar wireless devices (“prescribed apparatus”) are directly configured by the browser access. Rather, Parsons only teaches that the server which is in contact with the prescribed apparatus is configured by a browser access.

Parsons is directed to a method and system for providing previously transmitted messages to remote apparatus such as cell phones and pagers. See Abstract. Parsons teaches that the messages are first sent to a notification server 202. The notification server 202 has means for storing user information 204 related to the wireless devices. The Office Action cites to the disclosure of Parsons at col. 5, lines 57-65 related to the user information store 204. As discussed therein, the user information store 204 may be updated by user interface functionality with information related to the wireless devices for contact by the notification server 202. In other words, the wireless devices are not configured by the browser access, but the notification server 202 is configured as to which wireless devices to forward a message to when received by the notification server. See col. 5, line 46 to col. 6, line 24. Based on the above, Parsons does not teach or suggest that the wireless devices are directly configured from a user interface.

As described above, the current invention allows a user to obtain a configuration data entry field from a means other than a prescribed apparatus, enter configuration data and destination identification information to identify the prescribed apparatus, and then directly contact the prescribed apparatus based on the destination identification information. Contrary,

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.116  
Application No. 10/656,114  
Attorney Docket No. 031004

Parsons only teaches that storage of information for configuration of a notification server 202 is accessible from a user interface. As such, there is no teaching in Parsons which suggests that devices of limited memory such as pagers and cell phones may be directly configured without the interceding use of a centralized server.

According to U.S. patent law, as set forth in *Takeda v. Alphapharm* 492 F.3d 1350, 1356-1357; 83 USPQ2d 1169 (Fed. Cir. 2007):

While the *KSR* Court rejected a rigid application of the teaching, suggestion, or motivation ("TSM") test in an obviousness inquiry, the Court acknowledged the importance of identifying "a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the elements in the way the claimed new invention does" in an obviousness determination. *KSR*, 127 S. Ct. at 1731.

In the current instance there is no reason whereby one of skill in the art would derive the current invention. The Office relies on the teachings of Parsons of configuring an apparatus from other than the prescribed apparatus as motivation for the combination. See page 3, lines 15-17 and page 4, lines 14-19 of the Office Action. However, as noted above, Parsons does not teach directly configuring an apparatus from other than the prescribed apparatus. Wherefore, there is no reason whereby one of skill in the art would combine Murata and Parsons to result in a device having direct communication between a communication terminal device and a prescribed apparatus with a configuration screen having a configuration data entry field from a means for storing data other than the prescribed apparatus.

Claims 2 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata (JP 2001-186301) and Parsons et al. (US 7,031,437) as applied to claims 1 and 3 and further in view of Bates et al. (US 6,963,901). Claims 4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata (JP 2001-186301) and Parsons et al. (US 7,031,437) as applied to claims 1, 3 and 12 and further in view of Weghorst et al. (US 6,775,559 B1). Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata (JP 2001-186301) and Parsons et al. (US 7,031,437) as applied to claims 1 and 3 and further in view of Kley (US 6,947,977). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata (JP 2001-186301) and Parsons et al. (US 7,031,437) as applied to claim 3 and further in view of Harvey (US 7,054,924). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata (JP 2001-186301) and Parsons et al. (US 7,031,437) as applied to claims 1, 3 and 12 and further in view of Fields et al. (US 6,412,008 B1). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murata (JP 2001-186301) and Parsons et al. (US 7,031,437) as applied to claim 3, in view of Bates et al. (US 6,963,901), as applied to claim 9, and further in view of Harrison (US 6,434,502). Applicant respectfully submits that by addressing the rejection of the patent claims, as detailed above, the rejection of the dependent claims is likewise addressed by nature of the claims' dependencies.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.116  
Application No. 10/656,114  
Attorney Docket No. 031004

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael J. Caridi", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michael J. Caridi  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 56,171  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

MJC/ttw